



1FW

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Reply to Non-Final Office Action, in response to the Office Action mailed on November 23, 2009

| | | |
|------------------------|-------------|--------------|
| Application No. | Filing Date | Applicant(s) |
| 10/587,890 | 07/31/2006 | LIN ET AL. |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| SUNIL CHACKO | 2625 | |
| For: INTERNET PRINTING | | |

Commissioner For Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Sir:

Applicant requests that the following arguments of the patent application be entered in response to the office action mailed on November 23, 2009.

Arguments

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

After studying the inventions of Lodwick and Parry cited by the Examiner, we find that some special design in our invention is not obvious in the design of Lodwick and Parry. Hence Applicant requests the Examiner to reconsider the rejection of claims.

Let us draw Diagrams to show the designs of Parry, Lodwick and ours, and write brief summaries of these designs.

